Quasi-invariance and reversibility in the Fleming-Viot process

Kenji Handa
Department of Mathematics
Saga University
Saga 840-8502, Japan
e-mail: handa@ms.saga-u.ac.jp

October 19, 1999

Abstract

Reversible measures of the Fleming-Viot process are shown to be characterized as quasi-invariant measures with a cocycle given in terms of the mutation operator. As applications, we give certain integral characterization of Poisson-Dirichlet distributions and a proof that the stationary measure of the step-wise mutation model of Ohta-Kimura with periodic boundary condition is nonreversible.

Keywords: Quasi-invariance, reversible measure, Fleming-Viot process, cocycle identity
AMS 1991 Subject Classifications: Primary 60G57; Secondary 60J99.

1 Introduction and main results

In this article, we discuss the problem of symmetrizability for a class of infinite dimensional diffusions called the Fleming-Viot processes. They arose originally as limit processes obtained from models in population genetics and have been studied also from mathematical point of view. To be more precise, we need the following notation. Let E be a compact metric space and $\mathcal{M}_1(E)$ be the space of Borel probability measures on E equipped with the weak*-topology. We denote by $\langle m, f(x)\rangle$ or simply by $\langle m, f\rangle$ the integration of a function $f(x)$ with respect to a (possibly signed) measure $m(dx)$. For every $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(E)$ a signed measure $Q(\mu)$ on $E \times E$ is defined by

$$Q(\mu)(dxdy) = \delta_y(dx)\mu(dy) - \mu(dx)\mu(dy),$$

where δ_y denotes the delta measure at y. Denote by $B(E)$ the set of bounded Borel functions on E and by $C(E)$ the class of continuous functions on E .

We consider the Markov processes on $\mathcal{M}_1(E)$ with the formal generator

$$\mathcal{L}\Phi(\mu) = \langle \mu, A\frac{\delta\Phi(\mu)}{\delta\mu(\cdot)}\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle Q(\mu), \frac{\delta^2\Phi(\mu)}{\delta\mu(x)\delta\mu(y)}\rangle, \tag{1.1}$$

where A is the generator of a conservative Markov process on E with domain $D(A) \subset C(E)$ and the functional derivatives $\delta\Phi(\mu)/\delta\mu(x)$ and $\delta^2\Phi(\mu)/\delta\mu(x)\delta\mu(y)$ are defined as follows.

$$\frac{\delta\Phi(\mu)}{\delta\mu(x)} = \frac{d}{d\epsilon}\Phi(\mu + \epsilon\delta_x)\bigg|_{\epsilon=0}$$

$$\frac{\delta^2\Phi(\mu)}{\delta\mu(x)\delta\mu(y)} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial\epsilon_1\partial\epsilon_2}\Phi(\mu + \epsilon_1\delta_x + \epsilon_2\delta_y)\bigg|_{\epsilon_1=\epsilon_2=0}$$

Note that (**??**) makes sense at least on $\mathcal{D}$, the space of functions Φ of the form

$$\Phi(\mu) = F(\langle \mu, f_1\rangle, \cdots, \langle \mu, f_n\rangle)$$

with n being a positive integer, $F \in C^2(\mathbf{R}^n)$ and $f_1, \ldots, f_n \in D(A)$. It is known (see e. g. [**?**]) that there exists a unique Markov process associated with $\mathcal{L}$. Also, the process is ergodic if the semigroup $\{T_t\}$ generated by A is ergodic, i.e.,
(A) for some $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_1(E)$ it holds that $\lim_{t\to\infty} T_t f(x) = \langle \nu, f\rangle$ for all $f \in C(E)$ and $x \in E$.

By a theorem of Fukushima and Stroock [**?**], a Borel probability measure Π on $\mathcal{M}_1(E)$ is reversible with respect to $\mathcal{L}$ if and only if

$$\int \Phi\mathcal{L}\Psi d\Pi = \int \mathcal{L}\Phi \cdot \Psi d\Pi, \qquad \Phi, \Psi \in \mathcal{D}. \tag{1.2}$$

Main purpose of this article is to show equivalence between the reversibility and certain quasi-invariance property, which is introduced as follows. For any $f \in B(E)$, define a map S_f on $\mathcal{M}_1(E)$ by

$$d(S_f\mu) = \langle \mu, e^f\rangle^{-1} e^f d\mu. \tag{1.3}$$

Note that

$$S_{f+g}\mu = S_f(S_g\mu) \tag{1.4}$$

and in particular $(S_f)^{-1} = S_{-f}$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a subspace of $B(E)$ and $\Lambda : \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{M}_1(E) \longrightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be such that for each $f \in \mathcal{F}$ a function $\mu \mapsto \Lambda(f, \mu)$ is Borel measurable. A Borel probability measure Π on $\mathcal{M}_1(E)$ is said to be $\mathcal{F}$-quasi-invariant with cocycle Λ if for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$, Π and $\Pi \circ S_f := \Pi \circ (S_{-f})^{-1}$ are mutually equivalent and the density is given by

$$\frac{d(\Pi \circ S_f)}{d\Pi}(\mu) = e^{\Lambda(f,\mu)} \qquad \Pi\text{-a.s.} \tag{1.5}$$

In this case, it is easy to see from (**??**) and (**??**) that for every $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ we have Π-almost surely

$$\Lambda(f+g,\mu) = \Lambda(f, S_g\mu) + \Lambda(g,\mu). \tag{1.6}$$

This equation is referred to as cocycle identity. Main result of this paper is the following.

Theorem 1.1 *Let* Π *be a Borel probability measure on* $\mathcal{M}_1(E)$*. Then* Π *is reversible with respect to* $\mathcal{L}$ *if and only if* Π *is* $D(A)$*-quasi-invariant with cocycle*

$$\Lambda(f,\mu) = 2\int_0^1 \langle S_{uf}\mu, Af\rangle du. \tag{1.7}$$

Intuitive derivation of the cocycle (**??**) is the following. Suppose that Π is expressed as

$$\Pi(d\mu) = Z^{-1}e^{-U(\mu)}\mathcal{D}\mu \tag{1.8}$$

for some 'potential function' U, where $\mathcal{D}\mu$ is a uniform measure (like Feynman measure) on $\mathcal{M}_1(E)$ and Z is the normalization. Then Π would have some quasi-invariance property with cocycle $\Lambda(f,\mu) = U(\mu) - U(S_f\mu)$. On the other hand at least at formal level, $\mathcal{L}$ is symmetric on $L^2(\Pi)$ if and only if the negative of the drift term of $\mathcal{L}$ coincides with one half of the 'gradient' of U:

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{du}U(S_{uf}\mu)\bigg|_{u=0} = -\langle \mu, Af\rangle \tag{1.9}$$

and hence

$$\Lambda(f,\mu) = U(\mu) - U(S_f\mu) = -\int_0^1 \frac{d}{du}U(S_{uf}\mu)du = 2\int_0^1 \langle S_{uf}\mu, Af\rangle du. \tag{1.10}$$

Theorem 1.1 will be applied in two different contexts. The one is a characterization of Poisson-Dirichlet distributions. Given $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_1(E)$ and $\theta > 0$, the Poisson-Dirichlet distribution $\Pi_{\theta,\nu}$ is a unique element Π of $\mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{M}_1(E))$ with the following finite dimensional distributions:

$$\Pi(\mu(B_1) \in dx_1, \dots, \mu(B_n) \in dx_n) \tag{1.11}$$

$$= \frac{\Gamma(\theta)}{\Gamma(\theta\nu(B_1))\cdots\Gamma(\theta\nu(B_n))}x_1^{\theta\nu(B_1)-1}\cdots x_n^{\theta\nu(B_n)-1}dx_1\cdots dx_{n-1}\delta_{1-\sum_{k=1}^{n-1}x_k}(dx_n)$$

on the $n-1$-dimensional simplex

$$\Delta_n = \left\{(x_1,\dots,x_n)\,\middle|\, x_1 \ge 0, \dots, x_n \ge 0, \sum_{k=1}^n x_k = 1\right\},$$

where $\{B_1, \ldots, B_n\}$ is an arbitrary partition of E into finite number of non empty Borel subsets. It is well known ([?]) that $\Pi_{\theta,\nu}$ is a unique stationary and reversible probability measure of the Fleming-Viot process with the mutation operator

$$Af(x) = \frac{\theta}{2}\int_E (f(y) - f(x))\nu(dy), \tag{1.12}$$

for which we can compute the cocycle (**??**) as

$$\Lambda(f, \mu) = \theta\int_0^1 (\langle\nu, f\rangle - \langle S_{uf}\mu, f\rangle)du = \theta\left(\langle\nu, f\rangle - \log\langle\mu, e^f\rangle\right). \tag{1.13}$$

Therefore for $\Pi = \Pi_{\theta,\nu}$ and $f \in C(E)$ the identity $E^{\Pi}[\exp\Lambda(f,\cdot)] = 1$ which is obvious from Theorem 1.1 becomes

$$\int \langle\mu, e^f\rangle^{-\theta}\Pi(d\mu) = e^{-\theta\langle\nu,f\rangle}. \tag{1.14}$$

This is extended for every $f \in B(E)$ by standard argument using e.g. [?] (Proposition 4.2, p. 111). More generally, it is not difficult to conclude that $\Pi_{\theta,\nu}$ is $B(E)$-quasi-invariant with cocycle (**??**). However, we prove that the equalities (**??**) are strong enough to characterize $\Pi_{\theta,\nu}$.

Theorem 1.2 *Let $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_1(E)$ and $\theta > 0$. Then the Poisson-Dirichlet distribution $\Pi_{\theta,\nu}$ is a unique element of $\mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{M}_1(E))$ which satisfies (**??**) for all $f \in B(E)$.*

The other context in which we apply Theorem 1.1 is reversibility problem for the step-wise mutation model of Ohta-Kimura [?] (see also [?], [?]) with periodic boundary condition. This model is corresponding to the case when $E = \mathbf{T}^d$ (the d-dimensional torus), $A = \Delta$ and accordingly $\nu = m$, the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbf{T}^d$. Note that the process has a unique stationary probability measure because the semigroup generated by Δ is ergodic.

Theorem 1.3 *The stationary measure of the step-wise mutation model of Ohta-Kimura with periodic boundary condition is nonreversible.*

A key ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1.3 is the cocycle identity (**??**), which will turn out to break for $A = \Delta$ on $\mathbf{T}^d$.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we prove Theorem 1.1 after a series of lemmas on functional calculus on $\mathcal{M}_1(E)$. Based on Theorem 1.1, the proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 will be given in Sections 3 and 4, respectively.

2 The Proof of Theorem 1.1

Although we do not require our model to have any gradient structure, main ideas for the proof of Theorem 1.1 are due to those in [?], where infinite dimensional stochastic differential equations of gradient type are discussed. We begin with a lemma concerning carré du champ associated with $\mathcal{L}$, which is defined by

$$\Gamma(\Phi, \Psi) = \frac{1}{2}\left\{\mathcal{L}(\Phi\Psi) - \mathcal{L}\Phi \cdot \Psi - \Phi\mathcal{L}\Psi\right\}, \qquad \Phi, \Psi \in \mathcal{D}. \tag{2.1}$$

For every $f, g \in B(E)$, define $f \otimes g \in B(E^2)$ by $(f \otimes g)(x, y) = f(x)g(y), \quad x, y \in E$.

Lemma 2.1 *For $\Phi, \Psi \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(E)$,*

$$\Gamma(\Phi, \Psi)(\mu) = \frac{1}{2}\langle Q(\mu), \frac{\delta\Phi(\mu)}{\delta\mu} \otimes \frac{\delta\Psi(\mu)}{\delta\mu}\rangle \tag{2.2}$$

and for $\Phi, \Psi_1, \Psi_2 \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$\Gamma(\Phi\Psi_1, \Psi_2) + \Gamma(\Phi\Psi_2, \Psi_1) - \Gamma(\Phi, \Psi_1\Psi_2) = 2\Phi \cdot \Gamma(\Psi_1, \Psi_2). \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. (**??**) is easily verified by straightforward calculation. To show (**??**) first note that

$$\frac{\delta(\Phi\Psi)(\mu)}{\delta\mu(x)} = \frac{\delta\Phi(\mu)}{\delta\mu(x)}\Psi(\mu) + \Phi(\mu)\frac{\delta\Psi(\mu)}{\delta\mu(x)},$$

from which it follows that

$$\frac{\delta(\Phi\Psi_1)(\mu)}{\delta\mu(x)}\frac{\delta\Psi_2(\mu)}{\delta\mu(y)} + \frac{\delta(\Phi\Psi_2)(\mu)}{\delta\mu(x)}\frac{\delta\Psi_1(\mu)}{\delta\mu(y)} - \frac{\delta\Phi(\mu)}{\delta\mu(x)}\frac{\delta(\Psi_1\Psi_2)(\mu)}{\delta\mu(y)}$$
$$= \Phi(\mu)\frac{\delta\Psi_1(\mu)}{\delta\mu(x)}\frac{\delta\Psi_2(\mu)}{\delta\mu(y)} + \Phi(\mu)\frac{\delta\Psi_2(\mu)}{\delta\mu(x)}\frac{\delta\Psi_1(\mu)}{\delta\mu(y)}.$$

Integrating both sides with respect to $Q(\mu)(dxdy)$, which is symmetric in x and y, we get (**??**) by making use of (**??**). ■

To show both implications in Theorem 1.1, we will use the following, which is an immediate consequence of (**??**) combined with (**??**).

Lemma 2.2 *Let $\Pi \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{M}_1(E))$. Then Π is reversible with respect to $\mathcal{L}$ if and only if*

$$-\int \Phi\mathcal{L}\Psi d\Pi = \frac{1}{2}\int\langle Q(\mu), \frac{\delta\Phi(\mu)}{\delta\mu} \otimes \frac{\delta\Psi(\mu)}{\delta\mu}\rangle\Pi(d\mu), \qquad \Phi, \Psi \in \mathcal{D}. \tag{2.4}$$

Next lemma gives differentials along the transform of mild perturbations $\mu \mapsto S_f\mu$.

Lemma 2.3 *Suppose that $f \in D(A)$ is given. Put $\mu_t = S_{-tf}\mu$ for $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(E)$ and $t \in \mathbf{R}$. Furthermore set $\Phi_t(\mu) = \Phi(\mu_t)$ for each $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}$. Then it holds that*

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Phi(\mu_t) = -\langle Q(\mu_t), f \otimes \frac{\delta\Phi(\mu_t)}{\delta\mu_t}\rangle = -\langle Q(\mu), f \otimes \frac{\delta\Phi_t(\mu)}{\delta\mu}\rangle \tag{2.5}$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Lambda(tf, \mu_t) = 2\langle\mu_t, Af\rangle. \tag{2.6}$$

Proof. Suppose that Φ is of the form

$$\Phi(\mu) = F(\langle \mu, f_1\rangle, \ldots, \langle \mu, f_n\rangle), \tag{2.7}$$

where $F \in C^2(\mathbf{R}^n)$, $f_1, \ldots, f_n \in D(A)$. Then by direct computation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\Phi(\mu_t) &= \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{\partial F}{\partial u_k}(\langle \mu_t, f_1\rangle, \ldots, \langle \mu_t, f_n\rangle) \cdot (\langle \mu_t, (-f)f_k\rangle - \langle \mu_t, -f\rangle\langle \mu_, f_k\rangle) \\ &= -\langle Q(\mu_t), f \otimes \frac{\delta\Phi(\mu_t)}{\delta\mu_t}\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since

$$\frac{\delta\Phi_t(\mu)}{\delta\mu(x)} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{\partial F}{\partial u_k}(\langle \mu_t, f_1\rangle, \ldots, \langle \mu_t, f_n\rangle) \cdot \left(\frac{f_k(x)e^{-tf(x)}}{\langle \mu, e^{-tf}\rangle} - \frac{\langle \mu, f_k e^{-utf}\rangle}{\langle \mu, e^{-tf}\rangle^2} e^{-tf(x)} \right),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Q(\mu), f \otimes \frac{\delta\Phi_t(\mu)}{\delta\mu}\rangle &= \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{\partial F}{\partial u_k}(\langle \mu_t, f_1\rangle, \ldots, \langle \mu_t, f_n\rangle) \cdot (\langle \mu_t, f \cdot f_k\rangle - \langle \mu_t, f\rangle\langle \mu_t, f_k\rangle) \\ &= -\frac{d}{dt}\Phi(\mu_t), \end{aligned}$$

proving (**??**). (**??**) follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(tf, \mu_t) &= \int_0^1 \langle S_{utf}\mu_t, A(tf)\rangle du = 2t \int_0^1 \langle S_{-(1-u)tf}\mu, Af\rangle du \\ &= 2t \int_0^1 \langle S_{-utf}\mu, Af\rangle du = 2\int_0^t \langle S_{-uf}\mu, Af\rangle du. \end{aligned}$$

■

Proof of Theorem 1.1: reversibility implies quasi-invariance.
Here we assume that $\Pi \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{M}_1(E))$ is reversible with respect to $\mathcal{L}$. Fix an $f \in D(A)$. What we must show is that

$$\int \Phi(\mu)(\Pi \circ S_f)(d\mu) := \int \Phi(S_{-f}\mu)\Pi(d\mu) = \int \Phi(\mu)e^{\Lambda(f,\mu)}\Pi(d\mu) \tag{2.8}$$

holds for all $\Phi \in C(\mathcal{M}_1(E))$. Replacing $\Phi(\mu)$ by $\Phi(\mu)\exp[-\Lambda(f,\mu)]$ and noting that $\mathcal{D}$ is measure-determining on $\mathcal{M}_1(E)$, we see that it is sufficient to prove

$$\int \Phi(S_{-f}\mu)e^{-\Lambda(f,S_{-f}\mu)}\Pi(d\mu) = \int \Phi(\mu)\Pi(d\mu) \tag{2.9}$$

for each $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}$. In what follows, we shall show that

$$Z(t) := \int \Phi(S_{-tf}\mu)e^{-\Lambda(tf,S_{-tf}\mu)}\Pi(d\mu)$$

is a constant function of $t \in \mathbf{R}$. Using the same notation as in Lemma 2.3 and putting

$$\widetilde{\Phi}_t(\mu) = \Phi_t(\mu)e^{-\Lambda(tf,\mu_t)} = \Phi(S_{-tf}\mu)e^{-\Lambda(tf,S_{-tf}\mu)},$$

observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\delta\widetilde{\Phi}_t(\mu)}{\delta\mu(x)} &= \frac{\delta\Phi_t(\mu)}{\delta\mu(x)}e^{-\Lambda(tf,\mu_t)} \\ &\quad -2\widetilde{\Phi}_t(\mu)\int_0^1 t\left(\frac{Af(x)e^{-utf(x)}}{\langle\mu, e^{-utf}\rangle} - \frac{\langle\mu, Afe^{-utf}\rangle}{\langle\mu, e^{-utf}\rangle^2}e^{-utf(x)}\right)du.\end{aligned}$$

Hence by (**??**)

$$\begin{aligned}\langle Q(\mu), f\otimes\frac{\delta\widetilde{\Phi}_t(\mu)}{\delta\mu}\rangle &= \langle Q(\mu), f\otimes\frac{\delta\Phi_t(\mu)}{\delta\mu}\rangle e^{-\Lambda(tf,\mu_t)} \\ &\quad -2\widetilde{\Phi}_t(\mu)\int_0^t\left(\langle\mu_u, fAf\rangle - \langle\mu_u, f\rangle\langle\mu_u, Af\rangle\right)du \\ &= -\frac{d}{dt}\Phi(\mu_t)\cdot e^{-\Lambda(tf,\mu_t)} + 2\widetilde{\Phi}_t(\mu)(\langle\mu_t, Af\rangle - \langle\mu, Af\rangle).\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (**??**), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}Z'(t) &= \int\frac{d}{dt}\Phi(\mu_t)\cdot e^{-\Lambda(tf,\mu_t)}\Pi(d\mu) - \int\widetilde{\Phi}_t(\mu)\frac{d}{dt}\Lambda(tf,\mu_t)\Pi(d\mu) \\ &= \int\left(-\langle Q(\mu), f\otimes\frac{\delta\widetilde{\Phi}_t(\mu)}{\delta\mu}\rangle + 2\widetilde{\Phi}_t(\mu)(\langle\mu_t, Af\rangle - \langle\mu, Af\rangle)\right)\Pi(d\mu) \\ &\quad -2\int\widetilde{\Phi}_t(\mu)\langle\mu_t, Af\rangle\Pi(d\mu) \\ &= -\int\langle Q(\mu), f\otimes\frac{\delta\widetilde{\Phi}_t(\mu)}{\delta\mu}\rangle\Pi(d\mu) - 2\int\langle\mu, Af\rangle\widetilde{\Phi}_t(\mu)\Pi(d\mu) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

In the last equality we used Lemma 2.2 with $\Phi(\mu) = \widetilde{\Phi}_t(\mu)$ and $\Psi(\mu) = \langle\mu, f\rangle$. In fact, $\widetilde{\Phi}_t$ does not belong to $\mathcal{D}$ and so we have to find a sequence $\{\widetilde{\Phi}_t^n\}$ in $\mathcal{D}$ such that

$$\widetilde{\Phi}_t(\mu) = \lim_{n\to\infty}\widetilde{\Phi}_t^n(\mu), \qquad \frac{\delta\widetilde{\Phi}_t(\mu)}{\delta\mu(x)} = \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\delta\widetilde{\Phi}_t^n(\mu)}{\delta\mu(x)}$$

boundedly in $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(E)$ and $x \in E$. This is done by using the fact that $D(A)$ is dense in $C(E)$. Consequently $Z'(t) = 0$, which implies (**??**) and completes the proof of the last half of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1: quasi-invariance implies reversibility.
Suppose that Π is $D(A)$-quasi invariant with cocycle given by (**??**). Let $f \in D(A)$. We continue to use the same notation as in Lemma 2.3. Quasi-invariant property implies that for each $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}$ and $F \in C^2(\mathbf{R})$

$$W(t) := \int\Phi(\mu_t)F'(\langle\mu_t, f\rangle)e^{-\Lambda(tf,\mu_t)}\Pi(d\mu)$$

is independent of $t \in \mathbf{R}$. Differentiating in t and then letting $t = 0$, we obtain by computations similar to those for $Z'(0)$

$$\begin{aligned}
0 = W'(0) &= -\int \langle Q(\mu), \frac{\delta\Phi(\mu)}{\delta\mu} \otimes f\rangle F'(\langle\mu, f\rangle)\Pi(d\mu) \\
&\quad -\int \Phi(\mu)\left\{\langle\mu, f^2\rangle - \langle\mu, f\rangle^2\right\} F''(\langle\mu, f\rangle)\Pi(d\mu) \\
&\quad -2\int \Phi(\mu)\langle\mu, Af\rangle F'(\langle\mu, f\rangle)\Pi(d\mu) \\
&= -\int \langle Q(\mu), \frac{\delta\Phi(\mu)}{\delta\mu} \otimes \frac{\delta\Psi(\mu)}{\delta\mu}\rangle\Pi(\mu) - 2\int \Phi\mathcal{L}\Psi\Pi(d\mu).
\end{aligned}$$

In the last equality we put $\Psi(\mu) = F(\langle\mu, f\rangle)$. This shows that (**??**) holds at least when $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}$ and Ψ's are of this type. With the help of Lemma 2.1, (**??**) can be extended for those Ψ's of the form $\Psi(\mu) = \Psi_1(\mu)\Psi_2(\mu)$ with $\Psi_i(\mu) = F_i(\langle\mu, f_i\rangle), F_i \in C_b^2(\mathbf{R}), f_i \in D(A)$ $(i = 1, 2)$. Indeed, by (**??**)

$$\begin{aligned}
-\int \Phi\cdot\mathcal{L}(\Psi_1\Psi_2)d\Pi &= \int \Phi\left\{-2\Gamma(\Psi_1, \Psi_2) - \mathcal{L}\Psi_1\cdot\Psi_2 - \Psi_1\cdot\mathcal{L}\Psi_2\right\}d\Pi \\
&= \int \left\{-\Gamma(\Phi\Psi_1, \Psi_2) - \Gamma(\Phi\Psi_2, \Psi_1) + \Gamma(\Phi, \Psi_1\Psi_2)\right\}d\Pi \\
&\quad + \int \Gamma(\Phi\Psi_1, \Psi_2)d\Pi + \int \Gamma(\Phi\Psi_2, \Psi_1)d\Pi \\
&= \int \Gamma(\Phi, \Psi_1\Psi_2)d\Pi \quad = \quad \frac{1}{2}\int \langle Q(\mu), \frac{\delta\Phi}{\delta\mu} \otimes \frac{\delta(\Psi_1\Psi_2)}{\delta\mu}\rangle\Pi(d\mu).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover it is easily seen by induction that (**??**) is valid for all $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}$ and Ψ such that

$$\Psi(\mu) = \prod_{k=1}^{n} F_k(\langle\mu, f_k\rangle),$$

where n is a positive integer, $F_k \in C^2(\mathbf{R}), f_k \in D(A)$ $(k = 1, \ldots, n)$. This allows us to conclude that (**??**) holds for all $\Psi, \Psi \in \mathcal{D}$, and the reversibility of Π has been proved by Lemma 2.2. ■

3 Poisson-Dirichlet distributions

In this section, we consider the case when the mutation operator A is of the form

$$Af(x) = \frac{\theta}{2}\int_E (f(y) - f(x))\nu(dy), \tag{3.1}$$

where θ is a positive constant and $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_1(E)$ is given. In other words, the mutation mechanism is of neutral type. It is known that the (nonselective) Fleming-Viot process with the above A has a unique stationary probability measure which is identified with the Poisson-Dirichlet distribution $\Pi_{\theta,\nu}$ and is also reversible with respect to $\mathcal{L}$. One might think of more general mutation operators

$$\widetilde{A}f(x) = \frac{\theta}{2}\int_E (f(y) - f(x))P(x, dy), \tag{3.2}$$

where $P(x, dy)$ is a probability kernel. However, Li-Shiga-Yao [?] proved under a suitable irreducibility condition on the semigroup generated by $\widetilde{A}$ that the Fleming-Viot process with the mutation operator $\widetilde{A}$ (and a bounded selective intensity function) cannot have a reversible probability measure otherwise $\widetilde{A}$ is of neutral type.

Applying Theorem 1.1, we saw in Section 1 that $\Pi_{\theta,\nu}$ is $B(E)$-quasi-invariant with cocycle

$$\Lambda(f, \mu) = \theta\left(\langle \nu, f\rangle - \log\langle \mu, e^f\rangle\right). \tag{3.3}$$

(See (**??**) for more detail.)

Remarks (i) Because we have finite dimensional distributions (**??**) explicitly, this property can be shown also by direct computations of Jacobians plus suitable approximation procedures. Indeed, one of important observations involved is that a σ-finite measure

$$x_1^{-1}\cdots x_n^{-1}dx_1\cdots dx_{n-1} \tag{3.4}$$

on

$$\left\{(x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1})\,\middle|\, x_1 \geq 0, \ldots, x_{n-1} \geq 0, x_n := 1 - \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} x_k \geq 0\right\}$$

is invariant under a mapping defined by

$$(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \mapsto \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} q_k x_k\right)^{-1}(q_1x_1, \ldots, q_nx_n)$$

for arbitrary $q_1 > 0, \ldots, q_n > 0$.

(ii) For each $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(E)$, let $H(\nu|\mu)$ be the relative entropy of ν with respect to μ, i.e.,

$$H(\nu|\mu) = \begin{cases} \int_E \log\frac{d\nu}{d\mu}d\nu & \text{if } \nu \text{ is absolutely continuous with respect to } \mu, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

Then it is easy to verify

$$\Lambda(f, \mu) = \theta H(\nu|\mu) - \theta H(\nu|S_f\mu)$$

for μ such that $H(\nu|\mu)$ is finite. This suggests a formal expression

$$\Pi_{\theta,\nu}(d\mu) = Z_{\theta,\nu}^{-1}e^{-\theta H(\nu|\mu)}\mathcal{D}\mu. \tag{3.5}$$

(Compare with (**??**).) It should be noted that (**??**) is consistent with results by Dawson and Feng [?], [?], where large deviations for $\Pi_{\theta,\nu}$ as $\theta \to \infty$ is proved in the case of $E = [0, 1]$ and the rate function is shown to coincide with $H(\nu|\mu)$ provided that μ is absolutely continuous with respect to ν.

Recall the basic identity (**??**) holding for $\Pi = \Pi_{\theta,\nu}$:

$$\int \langle \mu, e^f \rangle^{-\theta} \Pi(d\mu) = e^{-\theta\langle \nu, f \rangle}, \qquad f \in B(E). \tag{3.6}$$

Before proving Theorem 1.2 which asserts that the equalities (**??**) uniquely determine Π, we require the following lemma giving 'derivatives' in f of the integrand in the left hand side of (**??**).

Lemma 3.1 *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(E)$ and n be a positive integer. Take $f_1, \ldots, f_n, g \in B(E)$. Then it holds that*

$$\frac{\partial^n}{\partial t_1 \cdots \partial t_n} \left(\langle \mu, e^{t_1 f_1 + \cdots + t_n f_n + g} \rangle^{-\theta} \right) \tag{3.7}$$

$$= (-1)^n \theta(\theta+1)\cdots(\theta+n-1) \frac{\langle \mu, \prod_{k=1}^n f_k \cdot e^{t_1 f_1 + \cdots + t_n f_n + g} \rangle}{\langle \mu, e^{t_1 f_1 + \cdots + t_n f_n + g} \rangle^{\theta+n}} + R_n(\mu)$$

with $R_n(\mu)$ being of the form

$$R_n(\mu) = \sum_{d=1}^{n-1} \sum_{\beta \in \pi(n,d)} a_n(\beta) \prod_{k=1}^{d} \langle \mu, \prod_{i \in \beta_k} f_i \cdot e^{t_1 f_1 + \cdots + t_n f_n + g} \rangle \langle \mu, e^{t_1 f_1 + \cdots + t_n f_n + g} \rangle^{-(\theta+d)},$$

where $\pi(n,d)$ is the collection of partitions β of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ into non empty sets $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_d$ and $a_n(\beta)$ are independent of $\mu, f_1, \ldots, f_n, g$.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. In the case when $n = 1$, it is easy to see that (**??**) holds with $R_1 \equiv 0$. Also, verification of (**??**) by induction on n is straightforward and is left to readers. (In (**??**), substitute g with $t_{n+1} f_{n+1} + g$ and then compute the derivative with respect to t_{n+1}.) ■

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Suppose that a Borel probability measure Π on $\mathcal{M}_1(E)$ satisfies (**??**). Let $t_1 = \cdots = t_n = 0$ and $g \equiv 0$ in (**??**) and integrate with respect to Π. Then it follows from Lemma 3.1 that the n-th moment measure of Π is recursively determined from the $n-1$-st moment measure of Π. In addition, it is easily seen from (**??**) and (**??**) that the first moment measure of Π is equal to ν. Consequently, the equations (**??**) uniquely determine all moment measures of Π and so Π is uniquely determined. ■

4 The Step-Wise Mutation Model of Ohta-Kimura with Periodic Boundary Condition

An immediate corollary to Theorem 1.1 is that if the Fleming-Viot process has a reversible probability measure Π, then the cocycle

$$\Lambda(f, \mu) = 2 \int_0^1 \langle S_{uf}\mu, Af \rangle du \tag{4.1}$$

must satisfy for all $f, g \in D(A)$

$$\Lambda(f+g,\mu) = \Lambda(f, S_g\mu) + \Lambda(g,\mu) \tag{4.2}$$

Π-almost surely. By continuity, it is easy to generalize (**??**) as follows:

$$\Lambda(tf+sg,\mu) = \Lambda(tf, S_{sg}\mu) + \Lambda(sg,\mu), \qquad s,t \in \mathbf{R}. \tag{4.3}$$

This gives certain information on structure of the mutation mechanism. Especially, exploiting (**??**), we will prove Theorem 1.3 which gives negative answer to reversibility problem for a specific model called the step-wise mutation model of Ohta-Kimura with periodic boundary condition. Before specifying the model, we give some general observation needed in the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Lemma 4.1 *Suppose that $f, g \in D(A)$ are given. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(E)$ satisfy* (**??**). *Then it holds that*

$$\langle \mu, Af\cdot g\rangle - \langle \mu, Af\rangle\langle \mu, g\rangle = \langle \mu, fAg\rangle - \langle \mu, f\rangle\langle \mu, Ag\rangle. \tag{4.4}$$

Proof. By (**??**) and (**??**),

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \int_0^1 \langle S_{u(f+g)}\mu, Af\rangle du + \int_0^1 \langle S_{u(f+g)}\mu, Ag\rangle du \\
&\quad - \int_0^1 \langle S_{uf+g}\mu, Af\rangle du - \int_0^1 \langle S_{ug}\mu, Ag\rangle du \\
&= -\int_0^1 du \int_u^1 dv \frac{\partial}{\partial v}\langle S_{uf+vg}\mu, Af\rangle + \int_0^1 du \int_0^u dv \frac{\partial}{\partial v}\langle S_{vf+ug}\mu, Ag\rangle \\
&= -\int_0^1 dv \int_0^v du \frac{\partial}{\partial v}\langle S_{uf+vg}\mu, Af\rangle + \int_0^1 dv \int_0^v du \frac{\partial}{\partial u}\langle S_{uf+vg}\mu, Ag\rangle \\
&= -\int_0^1 dv \int_0^v du \left(\langle S_{uf+vg}\mu, Af\cdot g\rangle - \langle S_{uf+vg}\mu, Af\rangle\langle S_{uf+vg}\mu, g\rangle\right. \\
&\qquad \left. - \langle S_{uf+vg}\mu, fAg\rangle + \langle S_{uf+vg}\mu, f\rangle\langle S_{uf+vg}\mu, Ag\rangle\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since (**??**) also holds, we can replace f, g in the above equalities by tf, sg $(s, t > 0)$, respectively, and get

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \int_0^s dv \int_0^{tv/s} du \left(\langle S_{uf+vg}\mu, Af\cdot g\rangle - \langle S_{uf+vg}\mu, Af\rangle\langle S_{uf+vg}\mu, g\rangle\right. \\
&\qquad \left. - \langle S_{uf+vg}\mu, fAg\rangle + \langle S_{uf+vg}\mu, f\rangle\langle S_{uf+vg}\mu, Ag\rangle\right)
\end{aligned}$$

for all $s, t > 0$. It is not difficult to see from this that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \langle S_{uf+vg}\mu, Af\cdot g\rangle - \langle S_{uf+vg}\mu, Af\rangle\langle S_{uf+vg}\mu, g\rangle \\
&\quad - \langle S_{uf+vg}\mu, fAg\rangle + \langle S_{uf+vg}\mu, f\rangle\langle S_{uf+vg}\mu, Ag\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

for all $u, v > 0$. Letting $u, v \to 0$ completes the proof. ■

Proposition 4.1 *Suppose that the condition* (A) *in Section 1 holds. Let* Π *be* $D(A)$*-quasi-invariant with cocycle* (**??**). *Then a unique stationary probability measure* ν *for* A *coincides with the the first moment measure of* Π*, i.e.,*

$$\langle \nu, f\rangle = \int \langle \mu, f\rangle \Pi(d\mu), \qquad f \in B(E). \tag{4.5}$$

Furthermore, it holds that

$$\langle \nu, Af \cdot g\rangle = \langle \nu, fAg\rangle, \qquad f, g \in D(A) \tag{4.6}$$

and

$$\int \langle \mu, f\rangle\langle \mu, g\rangle \Pi(d\mu) = \frac{1}{2}\langle \nu, G_{\frac{1}{2}} f \cdot g\rangle, \quad f, g \in B(E), \tag{4.7}$$

where $G_\lambda, \lambda > 0$ *is the resolvent operator given by*

$$G_\lambda g(x) := \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} T_t g(x) dt = (\lambda - A)^{-1} g(x).$$

Although the above statements were proved in [**?**] in the context of reversibility with respect to $\mathcal{L}$, we shall give another proof which is mainly based on quasi-invariance property.

Proof of Proposition 4.1. Observe by quasi-invariance that for every $f \in D(A)$

$$1 = \int e^{-\Lambda(tf, S_{-tf}\mu)} \Pi(d\mu), \qquad t \in \mathbf{R} \tag{4.8}$$

and so by (**??**)

$$0 = \frac{d}{dt} \int e^{-\Lambda(tf, S_{-tf}\mu)} \Pi(d\mu)\Big|_{t=0} = \int \langle \mu, Af\rangle \Pi(d\mu).$$

This shows that the first moment measure of Π is a stationary measure for A. Therefore we have (**??**) by the uniqueness implied by (A). Since by Theorem 1.1 Π is also reversible with respect to $\mathcal{L}$, it holds that

$$\int \langle \mu, Af\rangle\langle \mu, g\rangle \Pi(d\mu) = \int \langle \mu, f\rangle\langle \mu, Ag\rangle \Pi(d\mu), \qquad f, g \in D(A). \tag{4.9}$$

The equality (**??**) follows immediately from this combined with (**??**).

To prove (**??**) we can restrict ourselves to the case when $f, g \in D(A)$. Again by (**??**),

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \int e^{-\Lambda(tf, S_{-tf}\mu)} \Pi(d\mu)\Big|_{t=0} \\ &= 2\int (\langle \mu, Af \cdot f\rangle - \langle \mu, Af\rangle\langle \mu, f\rangle) \Pi(d\mu) + 4\int \langle \mu, Af\rangle^2 \Pi(d\mu). \end{aligned}$$

More generally, by polarization and using symmetry (**??**) and (**??**), we get

$$2\int \langle \mu, (-A)f\rangle\langle \mu, (-A)g\rangle \Pi(d\mu) = \langle \nu, (-A)f \cdot g\rangle - \int \langle \mu, (-A)f\rangle\langle \mu, g\rangle \Pi(d\mu).$$

On the other hand, it is clear from (**??**) that

$$2\int\langle\mu,\frac{1}{2}f\rangle\langle\mu,(-A)g\rangle\Pi(d\mu)=\int\langle\mu,(-A)f\rangle\langle\mu,g\rangle\Pi(d\mu).$$

Summing up both sides of the above two equalities yields

$$2\int\langle\mu,(\frac{1}{2}-A)f\rangle\langle\mu,(-A)g\rangle\Pi(d\mu)=\langle\nu,(-A)f\cdot g\rangle=\langle\nu,f(-A)g\rangle$$

or

$$\int\langle\mu,f\rangle\langle\mu,(-A)g\rangle\Pi(d\mu)=\frac{1}{2}\langle\nu,G_{\frac{1}{2}}f\cdot(-A)g\rangle,\qquad f\in C(E),g\in D(A).$$

We use this together with (A) and (**??**) to show

$$\begin{aligned}\int\langle\mu,f\rangle\langle\mu,g\rangle\Pi(d\mu)-\frac{1}{2}\langle\nu,G_{\frac{1}{2}}f\cdot g\rangle &= \int\langle\mu,f\rangle\langle\mu,T_tg\rangle\Pi(d\mu)-\frac{1}{2}\langle\nu,G_{\frac{1}{2}}f\cdot T_tg\rangle\\ &\to \int\langle\mu,f\rangle\Pi(d\mu)\cdot\langle\nu,g\rangle-\frac{1}{2}\langle\nu,G_{\frac{1}{2}}f\rangle\langle\nu,g\rangle\\ &= \langle\nu,f\rangle\langle\nu,g\rangle-\langle\nu,f\rangle\langle\nu,g\rangle= \quad 0\quad(t\to\infty),\end{aligned}$$

which proves (**??**) for $f\in C(E)$ and $g\in D(A)$. Extension for $f,g\in B(E)$ is immediate. ■

We turn to the proof of Theorem 1.3 which concerns the step-wise mutation model of Ohta-Kimura with periodic boundary condition. This model is specified by choosing $E=\mathbf{T}^d$ (the d-dimensional torus), $A=\Delta$ and $\nu=m$, the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbf{T}^d$. In this case the condition (A) is satisfied. In addition, the semigroup $\{T_t\}$ generated by Δ is irreducible in the sense that for every $x\in\mathbf{T}^d$ and $t>0$ we have $T_tf(x)>0$ whenever $f\in B(\mathbf{T}^d)$ is non-negative and $m(f>0)>0$.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Assume that the stationary probability measure Π for $\mathcal{L}$ is reversible with respect to $\mathcal{L}$. We shall show that this assumption leads to a contradiction. By Theorem 1.1, Π is $D(\Delta)$-quasi-invariant and hence by (**??**) and Proposition 4.1 it holds that for every $f,g\in D(\Delta)$

$$\langle\mu,\Delta f\cdot g\rangle-\langle\mu,\Delta f\rangle\langle\mu,g\rangle=\langle\mu,f\Delta g\rangle-\langle\mu,f\rangle\langle\mu,\Delta g\rangle\qquad\Pi\text{-a.s.}\tag{4.10}$$

Take eigenfunctions f_1 and f_2 of Δ corresponding to non-zero, distinct eigenvalues. Then it is immediate from (**??**) that

$$\langle\mu,f_1f_2\rangle-\langle\mu,f_1\rangle\langle\mu,f_2\rangle=0\qquad\Pi\text{-a.s.}\tag{4.11}$$

So by quasi-invariance property and continuity, it holds Π-almost surely that

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial u\partial v}\log\langle\mu,e^{uf_1+vf_2}\rangle=\langle S_{uf_1+vf_2}\mu,f_1f_2\rangle-\langle S_{uf_1+vf_2}\mu,f_1\rangle\langle S_{uf_1+vf_2}\mu,f_2\rangle=0$$

for all $u, v \in \mathbf{R}$, and hence

$$\langle \mu, e^{uf_1+vf_2} \rangle = \langle \mu, e^{uf_1} \rangle \langle \mu, e^{vf_2} \rangle, \qquad u, v \in \mathbf{R}.$$

This implies that under Π-almost all μ, random variables f_1 and f_2 on $\mathbf{T}^d$ are mutually independent. In particular, for arbitrary $\phi, \psi \in B(\mathbf{R})$

$$\langle \mu, (\phi \circ f_1) \cdot (\psi \circ f_2) \rangle = \langle \mu, \phi \circ f_1 \rangle \langle \mu, \psi \circ f_2 \rangle \qquad \Pi\text{-a.s.} \tag{4.12}$$

Integrating (**??**) with respect to Π and then using (**??**) and (**??**), we have

$$\langle m, (\phi \circ f_1) \cdot (\psi \circ f_2) \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \langle m, G_{\frac{1}{2}}(\phi \circ f_1) \cdot \psi \circ f_2 \rangle. \tag{4.13}$$

Finally set

$$f_1(x) = \sin 2\pi x_1, \qquad f_2(x) = \sin 4\pi x_1, \qquad x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbf{T}^d$$

and

$$\phi(u) = \psi(u) = \begin{cases} 1 & u > \sqrt{3}/2, \\ 0 & u \leq \sqrt{3}/2. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that $m(\phi \circ f_1 > 0) > 0$, $m(\psi \circ f_2 > 0) > 0$ and $(\phi \circ f_1) \cdot (\psi \circ f_2) \equiv 0$. This contradicts (**??**) since $G_{1/2}(\phi \circ f_1)(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathbf{T}^d$ by the irreducibility of $\{T_t\}$ and the proof of Theorem 1.3 is complete. ■

Acknowledgement This work was done during the stay at The Fields Institute, Toronto. The visit is supported by the exchange program between Japan Society for the Promotion of Science and the National Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada. The author thanks Professor Donald A. Dawson for discussions and gratefully acknowledges the warm hospitality of The Fields Institute.

References

[1] Dawson, D. (1986) Measure-valued processes – construction, qualitative behavior and stochastic geometry, in *Stochastic Spatial Processes: Mathematical Theories and Biological Applications*, *Lecture Notes in Math.* **1212**, pp. 69-93, Springer–Verlag, Berlin.

[2] Dawson, D. (1993) Measure-valued Markov processes, in *École d'Été de Probabilités de Saint Flour*, *Lecture Notes in Math.* **1541**, pp. 1-260, Springer–Verlag, Berlin.

[3] Dawson, D. and Feng S. (1998) Large deviations for the Fleming-Viot process with neutral mutation and selection. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **77**, 207-232.

[4] Dawson, D. and Feng S. (1999) Large deviations for the Fleming-Viot process with neutral mutation and selection II, preprint.

[5] Ethier, S. N. and Kurtz, T. G. (1986) *Markov Processes: Characterization and Convergence*, Wiley, New York.

[6] Ethier, S. N. and Kurtz, T. G. (1993) Fleming-Viot processes in population genetics, *SIAM J. Contr. Opt.* **31**, 345-386.

[7] Fukushima, M. and Stroock, D. (1986) Reversibility of solutions to martingale problems. *Adv. Math. Suppl. Stud.* **9**, 107-123. Academic Press, Orlando.

[8] Funaki, T. (1991) The reversible measures of multi-dimensional Ginzburg-Landau type continuum model, *Osaka J. Math.* **28**, 463-494.

[9] Fleming, W. H. and Viot, M. (1979) Some measure-valued Markov processes in population genetics theory, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **28**, 817-843.

[10] Li, Z., Shiga, T. and Yao, L. (1999) A reversibility problem for Fleming-Viot processes, *Elect. Comm. in Probab.* **4**, 71-82.

[11] Ohta, T. and Kimura, M. (1973) A model of mutation appropriate to estimate the number of electrophoretically detectable alleles in a finite population, *Genet. Res. Camb.* **22**, 201-204.